

POLITICAL.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

POLITICAL ACTION.
The Friend of Man of the 3d inst. contains a sketch of the debate in the annual meeting of the New York Anti-Slavery Society, lately held in Utica, upon the subject of political action. The speech of Mr. Garrison is so eloquent and powerful, and we are told by a gentleman present, that it produced a great effect upon the audience. We quote a single paragraph, and can easily imagine what must have been its power, uttered from the lips of a man who for years had not voted with any party—whose honest integrity none could question—and whose piety and philanthropy have been made manifest by abundant works. We can readily conceive of the effect of such truths, uttered by such a man—in all the earnestness of his deep full voice and impressive oratory.

I care comparatively little which party succeeds at the coming election, whether whig or administration men; and let me say, I care not a great deal whether an anti-slavery man or a pro-slavery man succeeds. But I do care whether abolitionists are found faithful at the polls. Then I shall have the satisfaction to believe that they will stand acquitted before the Judge at the great day; and their cause will have the benefit that they have done their duty, and this is all that can be required of them. Why, is it not manifest, if it be once settled beyond all contradiction even to the minds of politicians, that abolitionists are firm, faithful, and unwavering at the polls, as well as on their knees, then our victory, as far as political action is to aid in achieving it, will soon be won? Politicians do not believe the abolitionists will be out of their principles when they come to the ballot-box. Why, sir, look at the nomination of a recent convention. A man is held up for the office of governor, who is notoriously opposed to the doctrine of human rights, who pours contempt on the man who advocates the cause of the oppressed. You know whom I mean, I mean William L. Marcy; and we are yet to know whether the gentleman who is put on the opposition, is any more an abolitionist than the other. We are yet to know that Mr. Seward stands in any less fear of the demon slavery than Gov. Marcy. We shall know when we come to question the candidates: I repeat it, sir, we shall know by their answers or their silence when we come to question them. Is it not evident that politicians presume on the unfaithfulness of abolitionists? Why, common sense teaches that if they had believed the 10,000 abolitionists in the democratic ranks would have remained firm to their principles, they would not have put William L. Marcy in nomination. They have believed that 10,000 abolitionists of their party would be found recreant to their principles—that they would not hold themselves up to the calumnies of their political associates. They believe that we are insincere! Why, it was only this morning that my attention was called to an article in a political paper in this city, in which it is said the abolitionists of this district will prove themselves hypocrites. Shall we prove ourselves at the coming election, honest, or dishonest? A pack of hypocrites, or men of sincerity? It lies with you to determine; for myself, I stand here under a solemn sense of my responsibilities at the judgment; my heart is fixed, and I pledge myself that I will not aid in elevating an anti-abolitionist to office; come what will, I will not vote for a pro-slavery man for a law maker. And I have no duty of a political character which I shall be led to respect more than this. I have no duty of religion which binds me to one party—to this party or that party. Let us then pledge ourselves to each other, to be true to our principles at the polls, not merely on our own account, but for the true-hearted abolitionists of the State from the north and the south, the east and the west, that we will not vote for an anti-abolitionist for a law maker. Let us think, too, that our friends throughout the land, in their circles of devotion, are remembering us, and offering up prayer to the Father of all men for our divine guidance, and for our determined and inviolable adherence to divine principle. When we thus pledge ourselves that we will not vote for a pro-slavery man, we pledge ourselves as men, as men who have a deep and abiding respect, nay, a deep and abiding love for our common humanity—for the poor and oppressed slave. And when we thus pledge ourselves, we do it as Christians—as believers in the holy religion that we profess—as followers of him who has chosen as his representatives the least of mankind, and who assures us, that as we do, or do not, towards these, it shall be as a judge whether we do, or do not, towards him.

QUESTIONING CANDIDATES IN OHIO.

Dr. Dewey, the democratic candidate, in a long and very respectful letter, declares himself opposed to the admission of any new slave State; and strenuously in favor of the unadorned right of petition. "So long," he remarks, "as I have a seat in Congress, I will receive and present abolition and all other kinds of petitions proper to be presented. I will also make their reference to the appropriate committees, and do whatever else may be proper to be done, to bring the subject matter before the body in which I may have a seat, for its regular action." Dr. Duncan further says—

I have stated that I am not prepared to give you a definite answer to your third interrogatory. This may be construed into a wish to dodge the question—not so; and to avoid such a supposition or construction, I will show you that I am not entirely without opinion on this important subject, nor have I any hesitation in expressing that opinion at all times, so far as I have made it up.

There is no man living, perhaps, who is more deeply hostile to slavery than I am. My feelings—my education—the circumstances that have surrounded me through life, together with my principles of what I believe to constitute the natural and political rights of man—all conspire to make me abhor it as one of the greatest evils that exist on the face of the earth. Yes, greater in its moral effects and corrupting tendencies than all other human evils put together. It is not only a moral and political evil within itself, or intrinsically so, of the darkest and most damning character, but in all its bearings and effects calculated to produce the most fatal effects on both the moral and political institutions of our country. It is an evil that has, does now, and will in all time to come while it exists, invade in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder and death. For the truth of what I say as to its present effects upon the institutions of our country, I have only to refer you to a view of the slave States in our Union, and a comparison between the relative condition of the improvements of them and the free States. You see the free States happy and flourishing, to the admiration and astonishment of all who see them. Public improvements and private prosperity are swift and head and head in the race, while on the other hand poverty, lean and hungry sterility, and squalid wretchedness seem to cover the face of the land, in many parts where slave institutions have a residence. Cross the line that separates the free from the slave State, or stand upon it and look across the former, you will see comparatively all life, all happiness, all prosperity, both public and private; but turn your eyes upon the latter and survey it, every thing material, (except a few of the wealthy proprietors) bearing the impress of poverty and dilapidation; all looks as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad ravages. The anger of God and the re-venge of Heaven seem to rest upon every thing that can cast your eyes. Every thing seems to be withered and withered and disapprobation of AVENGING JUSTICE. In short, almost every property, public and

private, seems to be sickening and dying from the corrupting and corroding effects of slavery. But the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution!

¶ This reply of Dr. Duncan is frank and manly. He has since been elected to Congress.

From the Herald of Freedom.

DR. WAYLAND.

A recent journey through a portion of the glorious anti-slavery state of Vermont has prevented our preparing our weekly salute to this Reverend limiter of human responsibilities, this slacker of human obligations to God and man. We mean to compliment the Doctor in our vulgar way at least once a week for some time to come—till we have discharged fully all our legitimate, binding, unlimited responsibilities to the anti-slavery cause on his behalf. His work is the wickedest thing we have seen, done by the enemies of freedom. Done too by a Baptist—the same profession with glorious John Bunyan and Roger Williams—in the town of Providence too, where Roger Williams retreated for conscience sake! Shame on the Doctor. And we feel some indignation, moreover, and it is past human patience to suppress it entirely, when we see these title-proud savans using their formidable stations and their trained and cunning scholarship, to excite the mobocracy against us—hunted and menaced and mobbed as our brethren have been in this charming free republic. To see these Doctors 'cry havoc and confusion'—from their learned recesses and penitentiaries—with all the cold-blooded cruelty of an old, inquisition-tending cardinal. It tires our patience.

We have read recently a case in point touching the Doctor's 'Limitations'—from a book which the Doctor must admit authority, whatever his Jewish purgatory of New-York, or his Gentile admirer of Concord may think. The case is in the New Testament—it illustrates very well our doctrine of limitations of human responsibilities. It gives a case or two of responsibilities limited, and one of responsibilities unlimited. A certain poor colored Israelite went down (we may be inaccurate as to names) from Jerusalem to the neighborhood of Canaan—and fell among—Americans, which stripped him of his raiment, (outside and inside) wounded him, plundered him soul and body—put out his mind's eye, and left him—a good deal worse than dead. And by chance there came down a certain Priest that way, and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And likewise a certain Doctor, in the orderings of Providence, chanced to land that way—he came and looked on him—but being of exceedingly limited responsibilities, he passed by on the other side and put up a guide-board, to turn off all who might travel that way. But a certain Samaritan—a rash, misguided, responsibility-sort-of man, who cared more for his own conscience than for the Doctor's limitation guide-board, as he journeyed, (through life,) came where he was, and when he saw him he had compassion on him—and went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in the oil of anti-slavery and the wine of immediate emancipation, and he set him on his own Samaritan beast, and brought him to an inn and took care of him—'and, inferior' as he was, and having no dealings with Samaritans, he staid all night with him, and the next day, at parting, took out some little matter of 'compensation' and gave it, not to the thieves among whom the man had fallen, but to the honest tavern-keeper, and told him to take care of him, and he would be foot of the bill of consequences. Now which was neighbor to the poor man—he of the limited, or he of the unlimited responsibilities? We commend the Doctor to the story in the New Testament. Major Noah don't hold to that book—we don't know how it is with Colonel Barton.

From the Worcester Spy.

THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS for the trial of criminal cases has closed its session. We are not prepared to give a list of the convictions this week. We understand that Samuel Foster and Samuel Stratton, of Holden, with perhaps one or two others, were indicted for a conspiracy to deprive a woman now staying in that town, of the services of her servant, without her (the servant's) consent. The circumstances out of which this case has grown, have already produced some little excitement in the vicinity, and some pains have been taken to spread abroad an erroneous impression in relation thereto. As it may be a subject of judicial investigation, we have avoided saying anything about it, and shall now say nothing which may be to the prejudice of either party in such an event. We may simply state that the 'sergent' spoken of in the indictment is a colored girl; that the persons indicted had reason to believe, that, although she was, by the laws of this State, a free person, it was the intention of the person with whom she resided to take her into a Southern State, and there sell her as a slave. Under this belief, they took the best of legal counsel, and then procured a writ of personal replevin, under the act of April, 1837, with which the girl was legally taken from the custody of her 'mistress.' For this act, the indictment was obtained, and although it was obtained, the persons indicted have not been arraigned, or even arrested? They have been in attendance on the Court, and have, as we are informed, sought by all proper and suitable means to have the case brought to trial, but without effect. So far from shrinking from a legal investigation, they have courted it, and are ready, at any time, for it. When such is the fact, the public will judge of the propriety, the fairness, and of the justice, of holding such an indictment in terrorism, over them, while, at the same time, attempts are made through the press, as well as otherwise, to create improper prejudices against them.

¶ Here is a notable instance of ecclesiastical and religious hypocrisy, respecting political action.

LEAVING THE 'REGULAR WORK.'

The efforts put forth by some of our chief ministers and our official periodicals in this city, to annihilate abolition from the M. E. Church, on the ground that those of us who engaged in its measures 'departed from the regular work,' have convulsed our entire connection through the length and breadth of this nation. Columns after columns have been filled in our official, in this city, charges have been preferred, ministers have been arrested, tried, censured and suspended, in order to keep us to the 'regular work,' or such work, only, as is nominally recognized in the Discipline. Resolutions have been passed by the General Conference and by the Annual Conferences, to gag us on abolition because it was a political subject, and measures unheard of before, have been resorted to, to crush abolition, and rid the church of its advocates.

Well, now let us state a fact. The Rev. MAXWELL FOSBER, Presiding Elder on the Newark District, N. J. Conference, has been put in nomination, as a representative to Congress, from N. Jersey. Of course, this has been done by his consent; and if he is elected, he will 'leave the regular work' to attend Congress. Nay, by consenting to be nominated for that office, he has already led himself into the political squabbles of the day. Now let us see how many columns will be filled in the Christian Advocate and Journal with editorials and communications against this departure from the 'regular work;' and then we shall discover the real policy by which our opponents have been influenced in opposing the anti-slavery cause as they have done.—Zion's Watchman.

RICHARD HIMSELF AGAIN!

Some of our friends, on reading the correspondence between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Stevenson, were led to apprehend that the former was disposed to 'back out' from his charges against our negro-slaving minister. They showed the spirit he is of. What a pity it is that Gen. Hamilton did not succeed in 'stopping his wind!' Mr. Stevenson is now placed in a most humiliating predicament. What lover of his race, what true republican, will refuse to respond to the language of the Irish champion of liberty—No American slaveholder ought to be received on a footing of equality by any of the civilized inhabitants of Europe!—N. B. Of course, he ought not to be admitted into any pulpit!

MR. O'CONNELL AND MR. STEVENSON.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle:
Sir:—After my departure from London, you published, at the instance of Mr. Stevenson, the American Ambassador, a species of almost one-sided correspondence which took place between us. I have been prevented by other more important matters from sooner making a few observations upon that publication; and now, as you gave it circulation, I think I may rely upon your courtesy to insert my remarks.

In the first place, there had appeared in the Examiner a report of a speech of mine at the great Birmingham meeting on the first of August, which contained the following paragraph: 'I believe the very Ambassador here is a slave breeder; one of those beings who rear up slaves for the purpose of traffic. It is possible that America would send here a man who traffics in blood, and who is a disgrace to human nature? I hope the assertion is untrue, but it is right to speak out.'

In the next place, Mr. Stevenson, on the 9th August, wrote to me a letter containing part of the above paragraph; that is, he omitted the words which I have put in italics, and which manifestly show that the report could not be accurate, as these words made it involve a direct contradiction. And thus, having ascertained that the report could not be correct, he, with the gravity of a diplomatist, put to me the single question, viz. whether the report was correct or not? It being thus impossible that he should get any other reply to that question than that the report was not correct.

Of course, I answered his question accordingly, namely, that the report was not correct; but I referred expressly in my reply to another report of the speech in my possession, imagining that he would, upon such reference, call for the accurate version.

Thus far it is quite clear that no apology had been required of me. I am no duelist, and should, therefore, if asked, have stated what I really did say, abiding by it only as far as it was true, and abandoning it in any particular in which it might appear that I was mistaken.

But as I made Mr. Stevenson no apology, he determined on making one to himself, and accordingly he wrote a second letter, and in it presented that I had made a disavowal of offensive expressions. Now this was either finery or diplomacy. I care not which; but it was as gratuitous a presumption upon his part, as the reality would have been unnecessary upon mine.

However, as my speech did contain an important passage respecting the horrid traffic, which it is asserted, (I hope most truly) Mr. Stevenson participates in, I will state the paragraph as it was accurately reported in the Emancipator newspaper. I do this the rather to afford Mr. Stevenson, who seems so anxious about offensive words, an opportunity of disavowing, if he pleases, a thing most offensive in the sight of man and in the presence of God.

The real paragraph is this: 'It is asserted that their very Ambassador here is a slave breeder; one of those beings who rear and breed up slaves merely for the purpose of traffic. It is possible that America would send a man here who traffics in blood, and who, if he do, would be a disgrace to human nature? I hope the assertion is untrue; but it is right to speak out.'

Such was the real passage in my speech. I despise dueling, and mean nothing of what is called personality; but I do hope that, as Mr. Stevenson has already rushed into print, he will give the report which I have above alluded to a distinct contradiction.

It is utterly impossible that any thing should exist more horrible than the American slave breeding. The history of it is this: The Americans abolished the foreign slave trade early in the last century, but with this consolation—no small comfort to so many loving a race as the slaveholders—that by such abolition they enhanced the price of the slaves then in America, by stopping the competition in the home market of the supply of newly imported slaves. Why, otherwise, was not the home trade stopped as well as the foreign? The reply is obvious.

To supply the home slave trade, an abominable, a most hideous, most criminal and most revolting practice of breeding negroes exclusively for sale, has sprung up, and especially, we are told, in Virginia. There are breeding plantations for producing negroes, as there are with breeding farms for producing calves and lambs. And as our civil and lamb breeders calculate the number of males to be flock to the females, similar calculations are made by the traffickers in human flesh. One instance was mentioned to me of a human breeding farm in America, which was supplied with two men and twelve women. Why should I pollute my page with a description of all that is immoral and infamous in such practices? But only think of the wretched mothers whose nature compels to love their children—children torn from their mother's breast, just at the period that they could require their mother's love! The wretched, wretched mother! How can she depict the mother's distraction, her madness! 'But their maternal feelings are,' says a modern writer, 'treated with as much contemptuous indifference as those of the cows and ewes whose calves and lambs are sent to the English market.'

That it is which stains the character of the American slaveholder, and leaves the breeder of slaves the most detestable of human beings; especially when that slaveholder is a Republican, boasting of freedom, shouting out for liberty, and declaring, as the charter of his liberal institutions, these are self-evident truths, 'that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these rights are LIFE, LIBERTY, and the PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS.'

My sole object in my speech at Birmingham, and my present object is, to rouse the attention of England and of Europe to all that is cruel, criminal, and, in every sense of the word, infamous, in the system of negro slavery in North America. My deliberate conviction is, that until that system is abolished, no American slaveholder ought to be received on a footing of equality by any of the civilized inhabitants of Europe. I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant, DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Derrigane Abbey, Sept. 13, 1838.

Mrs. BIRNEY.—The large portion of our countrymen who love and honor Mr. Birney, will deeply sympathize with him under the afflictive bereavement which he has been called to endure, in the removal of the wife of his youth, the mother of his children, and the faithful companion of his life. We hope for a more extended notice of her life and character than our own personal acquaintance enables us to give; and will therefore only say at present, that the evident and perfect finish of her character, the generous steadfastness with which she has sustained her husband in his self-denying advocacy of the slave, and the uncommon equanimity with which she sustained the severe trial of protracted ill-health, the burial of six children, and the estrangement from friends and other trials connected with the abolition movement, have deeply impressed on our hearts the conviction that she was an uncommon woman, and that her removal at this time must be to her husband and six surviving children, an uncommon loss.—Emancipator.

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE APPROACHING ELECTION.

MR. DEAR BROTHERS,

I feel intensely, in regard to our coming election. Old Massachusetts ought to be better represented, far better, in the next Congress, than she now is. And, if our friends will only do their duty, there is a chance for her to be so. Let them throw away party considerations, in several of the Districts, discard both candidates, and cast their votes for true men, and there will, at first, be no election. Then comes another trial, and another, and another, till, finally, a good man goes in. Especially is this true of the Essex South District, the Middlesex District, and the Norfolk District, in your immediate vicinity; and also, in two or three more remote Districts. Saltanston and Rantoul, it seems, are to be the candidates in Essex South. Neither of them is worthy of abolition votes. They will do nothing. If our friends in Lynn, Danvers, Salem and Saugus, will scatter their votes, there will be no choice. And so on, trial after trial, till finally they will be compelled to take up one of our men. So, too, of the Middlesex District. Parmenter and Brooks are the candidates. Neither of them has any sympathy with the slave. They will vote to receive petitions, if somebody else will make the issue, and then vote to deny the prayer, if the question is tried. So, too, in District No. 9. Hastings and A. H. Everett are the candidates. I fear neither will vote for me. Hastings will do just nothing. Everett will do something. Now, if the Whig abolitionists will scatter their votes; or, if the Everett promises to do, will give them; in the former case, there is no choice. In the latter, a true man is elected—(going on the supposition that E. is true.) Now, will our friends be content to re-elect men who will do nothing? For, mark! Abolitionists hold the power in each of these Districts, and no man is elected without their votes. While they send men who will recognize their rights, while they deny those of the poor slave? I trust not. Don't let us submit to this humbuggery any longer. Meetings, I think, should be held in Lynn, Salem, Danvers, Cambridgeport, Groton, Melrose, Franklin, Andover, and other towns in these Districts, and the worthless action thoroughly urged home. I feel deeply about this matter. We have talked long enough about 'free discussion,' 'right of petition,' &c. Let us leave these 'principles,' 'right of petition,' &c. Let us leave these 'principles' to the next Congress, who will act on the aggressive—who will carry the war into Africa—who will, as President Green said, be abolitionists. Our State must lead in this matter. To defeat the election in three or four districts, would bring politicians to their bearings, and spur our members up to action. We can do this. Agitate—agitate, then, and it is done.

UP TO THE MARK!

¶ The above is from the pen of one who has done the State, the country, and the world, some service.—Ed. Lib.

REV. JOEL PARKER.

New York, October 10th, 1838.

To the Editor of the Liberator:
Perceiving in your paper of the 5th, a letter signed H. W. Davison, dated in this city, respecting the call of Rev. Joel Parker to the Tabernacle church, in which my name is mentioned, that contains several incorrect statements, clothed in very respectable language, I hasten to give you a relation of facts in justice to all concerned. H. W. D. styles Mr. Parker, 'the great apostle for slavery'; whereas he professes to be opposed to it, but had not sufficient hatred to this system of iniquity, or enough moral courage, to urge its sinfulness upon his slaveholding church at New Orleans. H. W. D. represents that Mr. Parker arrived in this city about three months since, that he was immediately invited to preach at the Tabernacle, that a majority of the people made strenuous efforts to have him for their pastor; but finding the abolitionists too strong for them, they invited the First Free Church to unite with them, under the joint pastoral care of Rev. George Duffield, a true abolitionist, and I. Helfenstein, a zealous colonizationist, who continued, amidst strife and contention, a short time, when both resigned. And he further states that, the way being thus cleared, Rev. Joel Parker received a call to supply the vacancy by a small majority of the members—that the writer and other true friends of liberty will not remain, &c. All this is incorrect.

The facts are, that Mr. Parker was not invited to preach at the Tabernacle, until long after the pastorate had been harmoniously united under the pastoral care of Messrs. Duffield and Helfenstein; and when it was found that the united church could not support two ministers, a few members, as a self-constituted committee, conferred with the pastors, and, after indicating that the united churches would not acquiesce in either remaining as sole pastor, induced both to tender their resignations. Mr. Parker had previously been invited by the pastors to preach on one occasion. When it was ascertained that both pastors would leave, the thoughts of the church were turned to Mr. Parker as successor. It is true, that some thought at the time, and do still, that it was in the contemplation of the self-appointed committee to invite Mr. Parker before a vacancy was created; and considerable dissatisfaction has been, and still is, felt, in and out of the church, at the supposed ill-treatment of Mr. Duffield. Providence opened a field of usefulness to both the late pastors immediately, Mr. Helfenstein accepting a call from Chambersburg, Pa., and Mr. Duffield from Detroit, Michigan. While they were in the pastoral charge at the Tabernacle, there was no strife nor contention in the church.

Shortly after the resignation of the two pastors, the church held a meeting to consider the subject of choosing a pastor. Mr. Parker was nominated, and his merits and fitness for the post were discussed at length during two protracted sessions of the church. Those who advocated the nomination of Mr. Parker, spoke of him as the pioneer minister of the free churches in this city, of his peculiar talents as a preacher, of his consistency, prudence, success in revivals, moral courage, the probability that he would attract a large congregation, and thus make it easy to support public worship, beside liquidating the debt due by the Tabernacle church. Those who opposed the nomination, (and I confess that I was one of the number,) showed the great inconsistency between Mr. Parker's preaching and conduct before and since his residence at New Orleans. The result was not, however, as H. W. Davison has stated, that Mr. Parker was called 'by a small majority of the members,' as only twenty-eight persons voted in the negative! It is not known to me whether the call will be accepted or not, and no members of the church, to my knowledge, have declared that they will not remain.

I have thus given a correct statement of facts, and cannot but lament that any one, although under feelings irritated by provocation, should have made so many errors in communicating to you a history of the affairs of the Tabernacle church, leading you to head it 'ecclesiastical juggling,' and have used language so highly improper.

I might have stated, that H. W. Davison is in error also in styling Mr. Helfenstein 'a zealous colonizationist,' as I never heard him mention the expatriation society which he ministered at the Tabernacle. He also commits an egregious mistake in saying that Mr. Morse of the N. Y. Observer, and Mr. Hale of the Journal of Commerce, have connected themselves with this congregation within the last three months. Mr. Hale has been a member of the church a long time, and Mr. Morse has never united with it.

Yours for the slave,

LEWIS TAPPAN.

ABOLITIONISTS TURNED COLONIZATIONISTS.

MR. EDITOR:
I send you an extract from a letter received by a brother in this place, from his friend living in L—, in this State, and as it may prove a source of valuable information, to our friend of the Parkersburg Gazette, I have thought proper (with your consent) to place him in possession of it, through the medium of your paper. 'We should not do you justice, should we not inform you that we in L—, who were formerly abolitionists, have become colonizationists; not in word, but in deed. Yes, sir, we have been actually engaged, in the

so called 'glorious scheme,' for within two weeks past, we have transported twelve 'fugitives from labor,' that heard of liberty at the north, and heard also that to follow the north star, would place them on a soil, where the oppressor could not reach them. Eleven of them, we know, are safe in Canada. The first lad, consisting of one man, his sister, and three small children, came to our house Thursday, just midnight. They were brought by—Esq. of K. We kept them through the succeeding day, and the next night, while darkness, and thunder, and storm, covered the face of nature, I was wheeling on towards her Majesty's dominions, to find liberty for the poor slave—and while padding on my steeds, occasionally lighted by the broad flashes of lurid lightning, I was deeply impressed with the fitness of the occasion, to the situation of the slave, and those who have influence in their hands to yield. Every thing around, above, beneath, below, the distant muttering thunder,—then a heavy, and a nearer clap, the rushing roaring wind, and occasionally descending torrents, on a common errand, would have caused me to stop,—but something whispered, 'do your duty to the slave,' and onward, onward, was my course. The first lead, I lodged with an abolitionist at the H—, and returned homeward where I arrived after sunrise. The next night I retired early to rest, being much fatigued, and at 2 o'clock in the morning, was again awakened, by a loud rap at the door. I arose, opened it, and was met by a man, whose first words were, 'I am sent to you by some of God's poor.' I understood his errand. He was a Mr. M—, of G—, he had Mr. G. H—'s team and six slaves, four women, and two men. We drove them together to L—, before daylight: they were kept secreted through the day, and the next night, were taken to the H—, and shipped to gether with the first five, on board the E— W—, and now to cap the climax of our colonization, early Wednesday morning, a slave from Charleston, S. C. came to our house. We kept him till the next night, when brother S—, took and carried him to A—, and we hope he is now safe. His case was very interesting. He claims to be a son of Holmes, a member of Congress, from S. C. as he was his master, and his mother was Holmes' slave, and by her had eleven children. He suffered much on his way here, was twice overtaken, and had his wife and seven children, taken from him. E. C. P.

LECTURES IN HINGHAM.

MR. EDITOR.

Rev. Daniel Wise has lately delivered a course of lectures on Slavery in this town. He lectured three times in the Baptist Meeting-House, and twice in the Methodist Meeting-House. The subjects of his lectures were the following:

1. What have the North to do with Slavery?
 2. What support does the Bible give to Slavery?
 3. What is American Slavery?
 4. Are there any circumstances which justify Slavery?
 5. What is Abolition? Gradual and immediate Emancipation?
- Mr. Wise has labored faithfully among us, and he has our warmest thanks for his exertions in behalf of the oppressed. We have some among us, who are good and true to the cause, but our people generally are determined that they will not become Abolitionists. They have closed their eyes and their ears, 'lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart and be converted.' We hope our friend Wise will find in other towns, those who are willing to hear the subject of slavery discussed, and who wish to be addressed on a subject which is of the utmost importance to us all. We commend him to our friends in other places, where there is any interest on the subject of slavery, and we do not think that all will be pleased with his gentlemanly deportment, his christian spirit, his regard for the opinions of those who may differ from him, and his unwearied exertions to lead all men in the way of duty.

Hingham, Oct. 13, 1838.

LEONISTON, Oct. 13th, 1838.

MR. EDITOR.—The Worcester North District A. S. Society, held a quarterly meeting here yesterday. At 11 o'clock, A. M. the delegates were requested by the President to come to order. Rev. Mr. Stebbins, of this town, prayed; after which, voted, that a business committee be appointed by the chair, to arrange and bring forward business for the meeting.

Resolutions were offered and adopted, (as a matter of course,) on the subject of universal freedom. Also, a series of resolutions were offered, not for immediate action, but for consideration at a future meeting of said society. They were as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Society, one of the most powerful obstacles to the progress of anti-slavery principles in most of the free States, is the great influence of slaveholders, either personally, or through the influence of their relations and friends, on the resident inhabitants; and that one of the most effectual methods of removing this baleful influence, will be to ferret out, and expose it, wherever it is to be found. Therefore,

Resolved, That we earnestly recommend to every social society of which this is composed, to appoint an efficient committee, or to adopt some other method, immediately, to inquire, and, if possible, ascertain—

1st. How many slaveholders are in the habit of residing a portion of the time in their town, or of steadily visiting it during any season of the year.

2nd. How many are connected with, or interested in slavery, either by marriage or heirship.

3d. What other influence, both in amount and kind, created directly or indirectly by slavery, is brought to oppose the anti-slavery reform.

Should these resolutions pass, (as doubtless they will,) through the societies generally, they will, in my opinion, be among the most powerful auxiliaries for ridding our country of one of the most horrid evils that we have groined under.

SILAS BRUCE, Sec'y pro tem.

GEORGE THOMPSON.

At the annual meeting of the Weymouth and Braintree Female Emancipation Society, the following resolution was passed, and ordered for insertion in the Liberator:

Resolved, That we would, with deep and heartfelt emotion, review the scenes of the 1st of August, 1838, when several hundred thousand of our brethren in the British West Indies were emancipated from slavery; and believing, as we do, that GEORGE THOMPSON, under heaven, was in a great measure instrumental to this glorious event, we would cordially unite with other Anti-Slavery Societies in the call, that when his own views of duty permit, he will return to America, and renew his exertions for the slave among us.

MARY WESTON, Rec. Sec.

POLITICAL.

The contest in Maryland for Governor was a remarkably close one. More than 55,000 votes were cast; of which Grason, the administration candidate, has only 259 majority. This, however, is a considerable gain for that party. In one county, Frederick, the votes were equally balanced—Steele having 2532, and Grason precisely the same number. The whigs have a small majority in both houses of the Legislature.

In Georgia, the whole whig ticket for Congress is elected by a small majority. This is a large gain for the whigs. They will also have a majority in the Legislature.

The returns from Ohio show a large gain for the administration, which has probably carried the State. Three districts in South Carolina have been heard from, in all of which the Calhoun, Nullification, State Rights, Sub-Treasury party have succeeded. Hugh S. Legare has lost his election.

In Pennsylvania, David B. Porter, the administration candidate for Governor, is believed to be elected by a majority of ten thousand over the indecipherable Ritten. The relative strength of the parties in the Legislatures remains the same as hitherto. We rejoice to say that the amendments to the Constitution have been rejected by the people.

The election in New Jersey was so closely contested, that neither party can tell which has succeeded until the votes are officially declared. It is believed that some on both tickets have succeeded.

REV. THEODORE CLAPP.

The editorial article, respecting this well known clergyman, upon which our friend Pierpont animadverted, was written by the late editor pro tem. On perusing the following communication, taking the liberty to append to it sundry notes by way of comment.

To the Editor of the Liberator.

Sir—My eye fell, last evening, for the first time, upon the notice which you, and a correspondent of yours, have been pleased to take of my having admitted Rev. Mr. Clapp, of New Orleans, into my pulpit. Had I seen that notice in season, I might have earlier offered you these remarks in reply to it.

As a citizen and as a Christian minister, I hold to the great principle—Freedom of speech and of the press. Let neither be muzzled. I am all at ease when my mouth is stopped, as when your press is; for then I know and feel, that the communication of thought from mind to mind is impeded, and, therefore, that progress of truth may be. I subscribe for your paper—(though the last first above stated view that I do not always read it so diligently as I might, to my own advantage)—not because I endorse, or even believe, every thing that I find in it; but because it is free, and is an advocate for freedom. I wish to be free, myself, and will be; and while they are mine, and so far as they are mine, my pulpit, and my people shall be free also. (1) I will be free, to tell my people what I think, and they shall be just as free to receive or to reject my doctrine, according to what they think of it, and I would much rather have them reject it, than I would much rather have them receive it, even if they sometimes might be misled, without the exercise of their own discrimination, to receive, as truth, whatever I propose. Blind robbers may safely swallow whatever is dropped from their mother's bill, into their open throats; but for men that have eyes, I do not think that the best way of feeding is.

Now, if I do not expect that my people will swallow every thing that I say, because I say it, it is to be supposed that I expect them to judge of what they expect, or are obliged—(2) to evaluate every thing that Mr. Clapp, (2) or I say, as occupant of my pulpit, says? They know better.

But you may say—'Surely you don't mean to let a man into your pulpit, who don't mean to let anybody into your pulpit, but myself, for I have never yet found a man, nor do I hope ever to find one, who does believe as I do in all points. But if you say, 'Yet you would admit him if he differed from you in essential and fundamental points?' I ask you, what points are essential and fundamental? (4) Which of us shall answer this question—and he that answers it, will have asked an endless—meaning by orthodox, Trinitarian—look into my pulpit, and sat by and heard him, as I hope and trust that my people have heard him, to edification. (5) My people never supposed that I endorsed all that he said, or that I would have been ever the more true if I had endorsed it. I have more than once sat by and heard a colonizationist address my people from my pulpit—not because I believed all that he said, for I think not much better of colonizationism than you do

... is enough for us, without 'render-


